

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 14, and 15 are now pending in the application. Claims 9-13 and 16 have been cancelled, without prejudice. No new matter is added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 2 stands objected to because of certain informalities. First, Claim 2 has been amended to delete the “further comprises the color filter . . . ” language objected to by the Examiner. Second, Claim 2 has been amended to clarify that it relates to “another” color filter layer, which is fully supported by the specification. For example, with reference to Fig. 2(c) two color filter layers are shown; i.e., color filter layers 3(G) and 3 (R). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that these objections have been accommodated, or traversed.

DRAWING OBJECTIONS

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) in relation to Claim 5. Claim 5 has been amended to recite that the green color filter player is “provided on the transparent substrate side of the second color conversion layer” which is fully supported, e.g., by drawing Fig. 2 of the specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that this objection has been accommodated, or rendered moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Eida et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,909,081; hereinafter “Eida”). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Claim 15 recites, in part: “any one of the color conversion layers have a stepped convex surface toward the transparent substrate . . . and the color filter layer comprising a stepped convex surface toward the transparent substrate.” (emphasis added) Thus, Claim 15 recites that both a color conversion layer and the color filter layer comprising a stepped concave surface toward the transparent substrate. In other words, both have a concave surface that (1) faces toward the transparent substrate, and (2) is stepped.

Claim 15 further recites, in part: “the color filter layer being provided on the transparent substrate side of any one of the color conversion layers.”

In contrast, the layer (14) which this rejection identifies as corresponding to the color filter layer is laterally spaced from any of the features (3) identified as corresponding to the color conversion layers. Thus, the color filter layer is not provided on the transparent substrate side of any one of the color conversion layers as recited in Claim 15.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Codama et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,121,726) in view of Eida. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, in part: “any one of the color conversion layers have a stepped convex surface.” (emphasis added) In contrast, Codama discloses only a

hemispherical or dome shape surface. Applicants further note that Codama teaches that this domed shaped surface face away from the transparent substrate, while any convex surfaces of Eida face toward the transparent substrate. In other words, Codama discloses nothing as to convex surfaces facing toward the transparent substrate (as disclosed in Eida) and Eida discloses nothing as to convex surfaces facing away from the transparent substrate (as disclosed in Codama). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the references *per se* teach away from combining these references together with respect to the shape of convex surfaces toward the transparent substrate. Absent this combination, Applicants respectfully assert there is no reason or motivation in the prior art to modify the hemispherical or dome shaped surface of Codama to have stepped surface as recited in Claim 1.

Since each of the remaining claims of this rejection depend, directly or indirectly, from Claim 1, Applicants assert they are likewise patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above regarding Claim 1.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 22, 2010

By: 
Michael E. Hilton, Reg. No. 33,509

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MEH/sm

15042038.1